

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 21-25, and 26-54 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 21-25 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 7, 8, 19, and 20 are/have been cancelled. Claims 11-18 stand withdrawn. Claims 26-54 are new.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found, *inter alia*, in Examples 1 and 2; page 2, lines 7-15; page 2, line 27 to page 3, line 5; and page 3, lines 11-25.

Support for new claims 26-36 may be found, *inter alia*, in Example 2 and page 3, lines 11-25.

Support for new claim 37 may be found, *inter alia*, in Example 1 and page 2, line 27 to page 3, line 5. Support for new claim 38 may be found, *inter alia*, on page 3, lines 7-9.

Support for claims 40 and 41 may be found, *inter alia*, on page 2, lines 19-25. Support for claims 42 and 54 may be found, *inter alia*, on page 3, lines 7-9.

Support for claims 43-45 may be found on page 2, line 27 to page 3, line 6.

Support for new claims 46-53 may be found, *inter alia*, in Example 2 and page 3, lines 11-25.

The undersigned and the Applicant wish to thank Examiners Le and DiRamio for the cordial and productive interview of March 6, 2008. The Examiners' helpful comments and suggestions were instrumental in preparing this Amendment. During the interview, Applicant's representatives and the Examiners discussed proposed claim amendments and some exemplary embodiments of the invention. More specifically, the undersigned discussed the embodiment described in Example 2. In so doing, the undersigned demonstrated to the Examiners how the claimed invention and the prior art of record differed at least in that the strip of the present invention operates by a different mode (gravity) than the system described by the prior art of record (capillary action).

I. *Withdrawn objections and rejections*

Applicant acknowledges that all previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph have been withdrawn. Applicant also acknowledges that the previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Geisburg has been withdrawn. In her reasons for withdrawal of the rejection, the Examiner acknowledges that the present invention differs from Geisburg in that the present invention does not operate by capillary action.

II. *The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) should be withdrawn*

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-6, 9, 10, 20, 21, and 23-25 stand rejected over Published U.S. Patent Application 2003/0207442 to Markovsky *et al.* (hereinafter "Markovsky). On page 5 of the Office Action, claim 22 stands rejected over Markovsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,723,500 to Yu (hereinafter "Yu"). Applicants respectfully point out that Markovsky alone, or in combination with Yu, do not teach each and every feature recited in amended claim 1, from which claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 21-53 ultimately depend. For example, Markovsky alone, or in combination with Yu do not teach a first immobilized component and a second immobilized component that are at a first distance along the longitudinal axis of the strip and a third immobilized component that is at a second distance along the longitudinal axis of the strip from the second immobilized component. Moreover, Applicant asserts that Markovsky's device operates by capillary action and not by gravity. *See, e.g.*, Abstract and ¶¶ [0006], [0010], and [0013]. In the context of the Geisburg reference, the Examiner has already acknowledged that the present invention differs from Geisburg in that the present invention does not operate by capillary action. Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, the Examiner should withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) over Markovsky alone or in combination with Yu.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunton & Williams, L.L.P.

Dated: April 1, 2008

By:



Laurence H. Posorske, Ph.D.
Registration No. 34,698

Ricardo J. Moran, Ph.D.
Registration No. 48,732